

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

MICHELE POLAND, Individually, and on
behalf of herself and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:20-cv-02489-MSN-cgc

SPRINGS WINDOW FASHIONS, LLC,

Defendant.

ORDER OF TRANSFER

Before the Court is the Parties' joint Stipulation to Transfer Venue. (ECF No. 46.) The Parties request that the Court transfer this matter to the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin. (*Id.* at PageID 239.) The Court finds the Parties' request well-taken and hereby orders this matter **TRANSFERRED** to the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1404(a), the Court "[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice... may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might have been brought or to any district or division to which all parties have consented." It is within the Court's discretion to determine whether transfer is appropriate. *See Sacklow v. Saks Incorp.*, 377 F. Supp. 3d 870, 877 (M.D. Tenn. 2019). The Court makes this determination by weighing several factors, including the interest of the parties, the public's interest, and other case specific factors. *See id.*

Here, the Parties’ requested venue— the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin— is a venue where this action “might have been brought” and where the Parties have consented to have this matter transferred. 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a); (*see also* ECF No. 46 at PageID 239.) Further, the Court, after balancing the relevant factors, finds that they weigh in favor of transfer. The Parties have jointly requested this transfer. The transfer of this matter would further judicial economy. Moreover, relevant discovery is likely to be located in the requested venue. Therefore, the Court **GRANTS** the Parties’ request to have this matter transferred pursuant to its authority under 28 U.S.C. 1404(a). In light of this transfer, Defendant’s pending motion to dismiss, (ECF No. 35), is **DENIED AS MOOT**. Plaintiff’s pending motion for conditional class certification remains pending for adjudication by the transferee court.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 18th day of February, 2021.

s/ Mark Norris

MARK S. NORRIS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE